BULLETIN of the
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The Role of the Campus Laboratory School

By

OTTO HUGHES

Vol. 35, No. 2 March, 1959

OFFICERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

HERMAN B WELLS, A.M., LL.D., President

HERMAN THOMPSON BRISCOE, Ph.D., Vice-President, and Dean of the Faculties

JOSEPH AMOS FRANKLIN, B.S., Vice-President, and Treasurer

JOHN WILLIAM ASHTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Vice-President, and Dean of the Graduate School.

WENDELL WILLIAM WRIGHT, Ph.D., Vice-President, Dean of the School of Education, and Director of Administrative Studies and Institutional Relations

CHARLES EDWIN HARRELL, A.B., LL.B., Registrar, and Director of the Office of Records and Admissions

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

WENDELL WILLIAM WRIGHT, Ph.D., Dean

HOWARD T. BATCHELDER, Ph.D., Associate Dean

PHILIP PEAK, Ph.D., Assistant Dean

(MRS.) DOROTHY J. MCCAW, Assistant to the Dean

OTTO HUGHES, Ed.D., Principal of the University School

KATHLEEN DUGDALE, A.M., Editor of Publications in Education

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF OF THE DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND FIELD SERVICES

HAROLD H. CHURCH, Ph.D., Director

RUTH FAY ARGANBRIGHT, M.S. in Ed., Assistant Director

W. MONFORT BARR, Ed.D., Assistant Director of School Surveys

PAUL W. SEAGERS, Ed.D., School Building Consultant

BULLETIN OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE ROLE OF THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL

By

Otto Hughes

Published by the

DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND FIELD SERVICES

Indiana University

Price, $1.00, postpaid

For sale by the Indiana University Bookstore

Bloomington, Indiana

Entered as second-class mail matter September 30, 1924, at the post office at Bloomington, Indiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Published in January, March, May, July, September, and November of each year, from the University Office, Bloomington, Indiana.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Review of Literature	1
	The Historic Role of Campus Laboratory Schools	2
	The Laboratory School Teacher	7
II.	A BRIEF REPORT OF VISITATIONS TO VARIOUS LABORATORY SCHOOLS	10
	University High School, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi	10
	University School, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida	12
	West Laboratory School, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida	14
	Keith Laboratory School, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania	15
	University School, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio	20
	Burris Laboratory School, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana	28
	Laboratory School, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana	30
	Summary	32
III.	THE FINDINGS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	34
IV.	THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN LIGHT OF THE FINDINGS IN OTHER CITIES	39
	The University School, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana	39
	Recommendations	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Dates of Establishment of the 29 Schools Replying	34
2.	Major Role of Campus Laboratory Schools, Based upon Responses on 29 Questionnaires	36

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the first semester of the school year 1957-1958 a study was made of the current role of a selected group of campus laboratory schools with particular emphasis upon the (1) type of administrative control under which each functioned; (2) relationship of the school to the public schools in the area in which the school was located; (3) pupil population; (4) major function of the school; (5) trends in the role of the school; (6) characteristics of the school plant; (7) method of the budgetary procedures used; (8) rank, method of selection, etc., of the school staff; and (9) student teaching responsibilities of the campus laboratory school.

Some of the information was derived from personal visitations and interviews, while other information was derived from questionnaires sent to directors of campus laboratory schools located on or near state university campuses, chiefly in the North Central area. Limitation of time and finances restricted the personal visitations.

Certain other information was based upon investigations currently engaged in by colleagues in the School of Education, particularly by the committee appointed by Dean Wendell W. Wright to study the major functions of the University School at Indiana University.

This study was delimited in the following ways: (1) only campus laboratory schools were included in the personal visitations, and (2) only those schools were included that were located on college or university campuses.

Since a new campus laboratory school is contemplated on the Indiana University campus within the foreseeable future, it was felt that the major functions of certain selected campus schools should be studied in order that information would be available concerning the general practices that prevail among college-controlled laboratory schools.

Review of Literature

Jarman,[1] in a study of laboratory schools connected with departments of schools or colleges of education in state universities in 1932, found there were 50 institutions of higher learning which came under the classification of state-supported and state-controlled institutions with the official title of state university. Teachers colleges, argricultural

---

[1]Jarman, A. M., The Administration of Laboratory Schools, p. 3.

colleges, and women's colleges were excluded from this classification. Twenty institutions had college-controlled schools on the secondary level, and 15 of these were in the North Central Association territory.

It is interesting to note in this connection that in 1932 Indiana University did not have a laboratory school. The student teaching was done in the public schools at both the elementary and the secondary levels. It was not until six years later, in 1938, that the present laboratory school was put into operation on the Indiana University campus.

The Historic Role of Campus Laboratory Schools

The concept of laboratory experiences for prospective teachers dates as far back as 1654, when the Duke of Ernest of Gotha wrote: "It is desirable that the teachers at their expense or with assistance remain in one central place and . . . through practice learn that . . . for which they will in the future be employed."[2] Seminaries were soon established in which students demonstrated their teaching ability by teaching their fellow students.

The first state-supported institution for the preparation of teachers originated in Berlin, Germany, in 1788. Student teaching and other laboratory experiences were provided "through visitation and observation of the regular school work, . . . and by actual teaching according to instructions and under the supervision of the director."[3]

In the United States, several private schools prepared teachers utilizing pupils in the training process. The first public normal school in this country was formally opened at Lexington, Massachusetts, in 1838. The first principal of this school said that the "model" school was very similar to the common school district school.[4]

It is interesting to note that, when the institution was moved to Framingham, a formal written agreement was entered into between the town of Framingham and the Normal School, which was signed by the chairman of the School Committee of the town of Framingham and the principal of the Normal School.

David Berkius Page, head of the Albany State Normal, was credited as being the first man in the country to have a clear-cut notion of the place of the training school in

---

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

[4] Ibid., p. 2.

teacher education. He conceived the purpose of the school to be one "to afford each normal pupil an opportunity of practicing the methods of instruction and discipline inculcated at the Normal School, as well as to ascertain his aptness to teach and discharge the various other duties pertaining to the teacher's responsible office."[5]

As early as 1857, laboratory school facilities were provided for in Pennsylvania by state laws establishing normal schools. In establishing normal schools, the law made it mandatory that, in order to qualify for a normal school in any locality, there should be a model school with accommodations for not less than 100 pupils.

At the First Annual Convention of the American Normal School Association held in Trenton, New Jersey, in 1859, the following resolution was adopted:

> Resolved: That this education of teachers should not only be theoretical, but also practical; and that, to this end, there should either be a school of observation and practice in immediate connection with the normal school, and under the same Board of Control, or there should be in other ways equivalent opportunities for observation and practice.[6]

Normal schools with the laboratory school as an integral part of the teacher training program continued to spring up throughout the country, until in 1874 the United States Office of Education reported 47 of the 67 normal schools had laboratory schools attached to them.

In 1883, Colonel Francis W. Parker became principal of the Cook County Normal School (later the Chicago Normal College). A laboratory school, kindergarten, and elementary school for practice teaching functioned as an integral part of this program from the very beginning.[7] The work of this practice school was devoted to experimentation and investigation on the work of teaching.

> Parker saw the growth of the child, especially character building and intelligent citizenship, as the aim of education. He persuaded his entire faculty to write in an attempt to construct a course of study in

---

[5] Harper, C. A., A Century of Public Teacher Education, p. 46.

[6] Ibid., p. 65.

[7] Rugg, Harold, and Counts, G. S., "A Critical Analysis of Current Methods of Curriculum Making," in Curriculum Making, p. 88.

which the elements of subject matter could be correlated around one great theme, namely that of effective citizenship and community life.[8]

Under the leadership of Parker, the Cook County Normal School developed into one of the most influential teacher-preparing institutions of this period. The school became a national pedogogical center and antedated the schools of observation and practice in all other institutions.[9]

A model school was opened in 1887 at Teachers College, New York City, and became a school in which "professors of education might experiment with the curriculum and methods of teaching as professors of science experiment in the laboratory."[10]

The Horace Mann School was more of a demonstration school than an experimental school. Nevertheless, one of the most influential factors in the redirection of public school classrooms during the years since 1905 was the utilization by Columbia University of the Horace Mann School and the Speyer School in the training of graduate students.[11]

John Dewey, as head of the Department of Education and Philosophy of the University of Chicago, developed a laboratory school for the purpose of scientific investigation and research into the problems concerned with the psychology and sociology of education. The aim of this school was to further the application of scientific concepts and methods to the conduct of school work.[12]

Charles H. Judd became Director of the School of Education at the University of Chicago in 1909. At that time, there were two laboratory schools, the undergraduate college of education and the graduate department of education. The laboratory schools, while continuing a vigorous interest in both child activities and child growth, began slowly to attempt to analyze the learning process under laboratory conditions. Under Judd's stimulation, a decade and a half of active laboratory analysis of learning in reading, handwriting, and arithmetic was inaugurated.[13]

As a result of the contributions made by Judd and his colleagues, education emerged as a profession that possessed a growing body of tested knowledge and skills.

---

[8]Perrodin, Alex, editor, Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education, p. 1.

[9]Ibid., p. 6.

[10]Ibid., p. 7.

[11]Ibid., p. 8.

[12]Ibid., p. 8

[13]Ibid., p. 8

In 1899, Teachers College, New York City, established a second laboratory school, the Speyer School. There was no tuition charge, and the student body was rather typical of the rank and file of the urban schools. The value of this quality was that a more direct application of conclusions, materials, and methods to public school classrooms was possible.[14]

The Speyer School extended its services to the adults of the community as well as to children from the kindergarten through the first eight grades. This emphasis later was changed from the elementary school to the junior high school.

In 1904 and 1915, laboratory schools were organized at the University of Missouri and the State University of Iowa, respectively.[15]

A third laboratory school was established in 1917 by Teachers College, New York City, to endeavor, by experimental methods, to assist in the reorganization of subjects and methods which were already under way in the fields of elementary and secondary education. No practice teaching was permitted, and class and group observation was restricted.[16]

In 1941, Teachers College merged the Lincoln School with the Horace Mann School. Two years later the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation was organized to develop cooperative curriculum experimentation, with the resultant discontinuation of the Horace Mann-Lincoln School in 1949.[17]

A laboratory school was organized in 1930 at Ohio State under the direction of Laura Tirbes. Experimentation formed the basic pattern of this school in an environment where teachers could be free to study children and their problems rather than to try out some plan previously conceived.[18]

Still other laboratory schools were organized, such as the one at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1916 and at the University of Florida at Gainesville in 1934.

The extent to which the laboratory school has developed throughout the United States is evidenced by the fact that, according to a recent survey, there are 167 college-controlled elementary laboratory schools and 85 college-controlled secondary schools now in operation in connection with teacher-education institutions. Five of these are classified as junior high schools.

---

[14] Ibid., p. 9.

[15] Ibid., p. 9.

[16] Ibid., p. 10.

[17] Ibid., p. 10.

[18] Ibid., p. 10.

Influence of accrediting organizations. In 1926, the American Association of Teachers Colleges, when establishing standards for accreditation of teacher-education institutions, adopted a standard which recommended that:

1. Each teachers college maintain a training school, or equivalent facilities.

2. Each teacher in the training school have responsibility for not more than forty children at any one time.

3. A minimum per student of ninety hours of student teaching be required.

4. For every eighteen college students engaged in student teaching, there be a minimum group of thirty children.

5. One full-time supervisor be utilized for every fifty student teachers in affiliated schools.

6. At least two-fifths of the teaching in training school be done by the regular staff or college faculty.[19]

The influence of this set of standards for accreditation for laboratory schools has been felt for over 30 years. In 1948, a report of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Sub-Committee revised the original standard pertaining to laboratory experiences in teacher education.

Standard VI of the revised standard is too detailed to be included in this report, but certain phases of it may appropriately be discussed briefly. The report emphasized that laboratory schools should enroll non-selected groups of children who live in a typical community setting. The desirability and necessity of staff, parents, and community cooperating in the dual role of providing the best educational program for pupils while at the same time giving prospective teachers adequate training is also emphasized.

The report further emphasized the necessity that each laboratory teacher qualify as a specialist skilled in guiding children as well as in guiding prospective teachers in the art of teaching, and that each laboratory school teacher who carried the major responsibility of guiding prospective teachers should also be recognized as a member of the college faculty.

Finally, the report stated that, as college enrollments increase, laboratory facilities should also be extended to provide training facilities for future teachers.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 11.

Margaret Linsey, reporting at the 1954 joint meeting of the Association for Student Teaching and the Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, indicated that the evaluation reports made by 76 institutions of teacher education showed trends in professional laboratory experiences which gave evidence that Standard VI had had its influence in causing the trends. Among other trends indicated in her report were the following:

1. A greater number of institutions provide opportunities for prospective teachers to observe and participate in the total school and community.

2. In general, students are spending more time in student teaching, both because of increased emphasis on full-time student teaching and because of the increase in the length of assignments to student teaching.

3. There is a marked increase in the use of off-campus college cooperating schools in all phases of the sequence of professional laboratory experiences.

4. The use of community agencies as a part of expanded facilities for laboratory experiences is far greater than indicated in 1948.

5. Students engaged in professional laboratory experiences still get their guidance from laboratory school teachers and college teachers of education with little participation in this activity by subject-matter teachers.[20]

It is encouraging to note that, according to the above report, greater interest is being shown in student teaching not only through an increase in the number of students enrolled but also through the increased number of schools participating in the program.

The Laboratory School Teacher

The teacher in the laboratory school plays a most important role in the teacher education program. E. Graham Pogue, writing on the professional status of the laboratory school teacher, said that "the task of the laboratory school teacher is extremely difficult. Perhaps no other teaching position in our entire educational system demands greater versatility, genius, and stamina. The laboratory teacher must be a skilled practitioner of the art of teaching. . . . Daily he must demonstrate his competency in the goldfish bowl of the

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 14-15.

laboratory school classroom. Truly the laboratory school teacher occupies an important and demanding position in our educational enterprise."[21]

In referring to the status of the laboratory teacher, he went on to say:

> The status granted laboratory school teachers is an important determinant of the quality of teachers who will seek such positions. Moreover, the contribution the teacher will make toward a healthy environment for the student teacher is conditioned by his status. . . . Only when the teacher feels he is an equal partner in a cooperative effort will he be able to create the warm social environment so necessary for the best development of student teachers.[22]

Through a questionnaire sent to 111 directors of laboratory schools in the summer of 1953, Pogue secured information concerning the status of laboratory school teachers. Of the 74 who responded, 52 reported that the college operated the laboratory school.[23]

Although Pogue found that "the typical laboratory school teacher works for an institution preparing students for teaching positions in elementary, secondary, and special subject areas," he also found that the organization of the laboratory school varied from "a single kindergarten room" on the one hand "to a four-year high school" on the other.[24]

The schools which were visited in obtaining information for the present study also varied in type of organization. Some had only kindergarten through grade 6 as an elementary unit, while some were limited to grades 7 through 12.

In most cases, Pogue found that the laboratory school teaching position was considered a permanent one if the person filling the position did satisfactory work. Few laboratory school teaching positions were considered to be training stations for graduate students. In one Big Ten university, the laboratory school teaching positions provided neither rank with the college faculty nor affiliation with the state teachers organization. In another midwestern university, the laboratory school teaching positions were almost entirely considered as a means of subsidizing graduate students. It

---

[21] Pogue, E. G., "Professional Status of the Laboratory School Teacher," in Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, p. 159.

[22] Ibid., p. 159

[23] Ibid,, p. 159.

[24] Ibid., p. 160.

appears that in either of these situations considerable difficulty would be experienced in maintaining an excellent program for student teaching.

Pogue developed a list of 12 minimum policies concerning the status of teachers in the laboratory schools. After the laboratory school administrators had agreed upon these minimal policies, they were asked to indicate the extent to which these policies were actually being carried out on their campuses.[25]

Of the 52 administrators, 25 reported that the laboratory school staff was recognized as an integral part of the total college staff, while 16 replied that it was recognized "in some instances," and 11 considered it was recognized "to some extent."

Only six of the 52 administrators replied that, in their situation, the teaching load of the laboratory school teacher was comparable to that of the other teachers of college classes. Measured in terms of clock-hour responsibilities, the laboratory school teachers averaged more hours than were considered to be a full load for college faculty.

The policy practiced by the largest number of institutions (30) was that of giving the laboratory school teacher the same professional privileges as are given to teachers of college classes.

The analysis of each of the 12 policies stated in Pogue's study does not come within the scope of this paper, but the conclusions he reached substantiate the results of personal observations made during the past semester concerning the campus laboratory schools which were visited for the present study.

Pogue's conclusions, based upon the responses from 52 colleges with membership in the AACTE, were as follows:

> From this study it is apparent that a wide disparity exists among teacher educating institutions. In some colleges the laboratory teacher is accorded a position of respect and privilege fully equal to, if not above, that of teachers of other college classes. In other institutions the laboratory school teacher appears to be tolerated as necessary for carrying on the work of the college, but really a rather unimportant person.[26]

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 160-2.

[26] Ibid., p. 170.

CHAPTER II

A BRIEF REPORT OF VISITATIONS TO VARIOUS LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Seven laboratory schools connected with universities or teachers colleges were visited and studied from the point of view of their organization, major role, administration, budget, and staff.

University High School
University of Mississippi
Oxford, Mississippi

The University High School at the University of Mississippi is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and has been awarded an AA classification by the Mississippi Accrediting Commission.

The school is under the direction of a principal who is responsible to the dean of the School of Education. The only other administrative staff member in the high school is a guidance director who spends two periods each day in the guidance office. The office staff consists of one secretary and a clerk-typist.

The University High School is the only secondary school in Oxford. Since the school serves the entire community in which it is situated, contractual agreements between the University and the County Schools Corporation provide the basis upon which the pupils who live in Oxford and certain specified nearby districts may enroll in the University School. Any other county pupil must either secure a statement from his board of education indicating his legal transfer to University High School or must pay $117 a semester, which is the amount of money guaranteed by the state under the state minimum education program.

The following excerpt from the Student's Handbook describes briefly the history of the school:

> The University High School was organized in the fall of 1929 and began functioning in the old Oxford Grammar School Building. It was largely through the efforts of Dr. Alfred Hume and Professor O. A. Shaw, then Chancellor of the University of Mississippi and Dean of the School of Education, respectively, that the plans were made to build a school which would serve boys and girls of Oxford and also provide a training school for student teachers of the University

School of Education. Plans for the building of the University High School were devised by a group of specialists representing the University, the U.S. Office of Education, the State Department of Education, and several of the leading colleges and universities of the South.

Since 1929 there has been much discussion and dreaming of an addition to University High School. That dream has now come true. A $550,000 addition was completed in 1956.[1]

Approximately 575 pupils were enrolled in grades 7 through 12 in 1957-1958. The majority lived in the city of Oxford; the others were transferred from the rural areas immediately adjacent to Oxford.

A written agreement between the city schools and the University pertaining to administrative and supervisory responsibilities is in force, but is subject to annual revision. The contract provides that the University pay 25 per cent of the annual budget, based upon the average daily attendance of pupils enrolled, toward the support of the high school.

The major function, as expressed in the Handbook, is to provide a school to serve boys and girls as well as a training school for student teachers in the University School of Education. There seems to be no need to anticipate a change in the role which this school is to serve within the foreseeable future.

One of the outstanding features of the new addition is a library named in honor of the former Dean of the School of Education of the University of Mississippi, Oliver Abbott Shaw. This library is considered to be one of the best equipped high school libraries in Mississippi.

At the time the school was visited, it had 19 full-time and three part-time teachers. The salaries of the full-time teachers ranged from $3,100 to $4,400 for nine months. The average salary was approximately $3,600.

All full-time staff members hold the master's degree with the rank of instructor in the School of Education. University School teachers have no teaching responsibilities in the School of Education.

Student teachers spend half of the day in the high school and the other half in college classes. They receive six hours of credit for 15 hours a week of student teaching. There is an overload of student teachers in English, social studies, and physical education.

---

[1] Student Handbook of University High School (Oxford, Mississippi), p. 2.

The principal teaches no classes, but he has no administrative assistants other than a guidance director who spends two periods a day in the guidance office. The administrative details involved in a complex campus laboratory school leave him little time for long-range planning on the local level and limit the possibility of active participation in state-wide educational leadership roles.

University School
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

The majority of the information concerning the University School at Tallahassee was derived from a personal interview with the Director of Instruction, Miss Helen Deans.

The administrative staff of the school is comprised of a Director, who is responsible to the Dean of the School of Education, a Director of Instruction, and a Director of Guidance. The responsibility for the supervision of the instructional program is delegated to the director of instruction, while matters of discipline with boys and girls are assigned to the director of guidance.

The income for support of the campus laboratory school is derived from payment of funds by the School City of Tallahassee to the University on the basis of current enrollment. All pupils are admitted by application.

The pupil enrollment is approximately 725 in grades kindergarten through grade 12. There are two classrooms for each grade through grade 6, with departmentalization starting in grade 7. The average enrollment per grade in the elementary area is 30, while there are approximately 25 pupils in each class in the secondary area.

A limited amount of experimentation is being carried on in the campus laboratory school at Tallahassee. The elementary grades are experimenting with the teaching of Spanish. In grades 7 and 8, a core program based upon "the needs of students" occupies the major portion of the time of the instructional staff. Particular emphasis centers around a carefully planned mathematics program. The pupils are required to have two years of mathematics for graduation and may elect mathematics as a major. Graduation requirements also include four years of English, four years of social studies, two years of physical education, one year of science for boys, and one year of home economics for girls.

It is interesting to note, in this connection, that the trend at the Florida State University laboratory school with respect to the student-teaching program is in keeping with the changing role of campus schools in many other parts of the country. The emphasis is less on supervision of student teaching and more on the pre-internship experiences of observation and participation. The off-campus public schools are

being called upon more and more to provide internship experiences for prospective teachers. According to Miss Deans, interns have been eliminated from the elementary grades in the laboratory school and, if present plans materialize, they will be eliminated from the secondary school in the near future.

This modern campus laboratory school was completed four years ago on 27 acres of ground within four blocks of the School of Education. It has been built in such a way as to provide for additional classrooms as soon as the need arises. At first it would seem that adequate provision has been made for all phases of the educational program; however, careful scrutiny reveals that some important facilities remain undeveloped. More play area for the kindergarten children is needed, since the present area is located so near other classes that the noise is distracting. In the main, however, the teachers are very proud of the building, particularly in view of the fact that each one played a part in the planning of the building.

A rather unique feature, which of course cannot be used in a northern climate, is an extension of the auditorium to provide for an open-air or outdoor auditorium. A limited budget necessitated reducing the size of the auditorium in order to keep within the appropriations, and the extension had to be added to accommodate such community groups as church, fraternal, and social organizations which make considerable use of the auditorium.

The library, centrally located and easily accessible to all grades, also serves as a teaching aids center. Under the direction and supervision of a very capable librarian, pupils in the sixth grade or above are trained to operate the projection equipment. Released time is provided so that the projectors may be made available to the teaching staff at a most convenient time.

The classrooms are equipped with the most modern, up-to-date furniture, much of which has been recommended by the instructor in charge because of its special design or feature. All the elementary classrooms are on the ground floor, with each grade level accommodated in a pair of rooms with connecting office space between each pair. Wide covered walkways provide adequate space for passing to playgrounds and other special areas. Nearly 75 per cent of the pupils eat in the school cafeteria.

Although adequate space and facilities are available for music, they are not provided for art. The auditorium and the art department are the areas that have been most affected by a budget cut that necessitated limitation in the facilities. Staff turnover in the art area has also been a handicap. The major problem, according to the director of instruction, seems to be that frequent staff turnover limits long-time experimentation and planning. This was the current director's first year in the position. The extent to which turnover limits the services that the staff could offer to public schools and the extent to which the present staff occupies leadership roles in the local, state, and national areas was not learned.

The minimum requirements for the teaching staff are very similar to those that prevail in most campus laboratory schools; namely, five years of teaching experience and completion of the master's degree. The teachers hold the rank of instructor and critic in their respective subject-matter fields.

West Laboratory School
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida

The chief administrator of the West Laboratory School of Miami University at Coral Gables holds the title of principal and has rank on the faculty of the School of Education. The organization and administration of the West Laboratory School differs in at least two respects from most laboratory schools visited. First, it appears to be less an integral part of the School of Education than are most of the other laboratory schools in that the building itself was financed by the Dade County Board of Public Instruction. Second, the teaching staff, although appointed by the University upon recommedation of the principal of the school, does not hold rank on the University faculty.

A joint policy-forming board is composed of three members representing the University and three representing the Dade County Board of Public Instruction. The University representatives on the board are the dean of the School of Education, the chairman of the Elementary Division, and one member of the faculty. The Dade County school representatives are the superintendent, an assistant superintendent, and the director of elementary education.

At the time of the visit, there were approximately 430 pupils enrolled in kindergarten through grade 6. The enrollment procedures are as follows:

> Attendance at the West Laboratory School is voluntary and is determined on the basis of a special application made in person at the school. Because it is not a neighborhood school, its pupils come from no particular geographic area. Application for admission may be made by the parent or legal guardian for any child who resides in Dade County.
>
> In accordance with State law governing admission to public schools, children who will be six on or before January 1 will be registered for first grade. Children who attended a first grade elsewhere and who did not meet the foregoing age requirement may not be registered for the second grade.
>
> The first sixty children on the registration list will be invited to enroll in the school. An invitation that is declined will constitute a cancelled registration, but a new registration is possible. Vacancies caused for this reason, or any other, will

> be filled with children whose names appear on the waiting list. Priority (in filling vacancies only) will be given in order of date of registration to: (1) siblings of children attending the school and (2) children of faculty members of the University of Miami.[2]

The major function of the West Laboratory School, according to the principal, is that of providing facilities for research and experimentation on problems of importance to both the University of Miami and the Dade County public schools rather than that of providing a place for student teaching. To a lesser degree, there is some opportunity for observation and participation by the University of Miami students prior to their internship.

The building is on one level, with jalousie windows protected from the sun by an overhanging roof covering wide walkways along all outside walls. The playground space is adequate. Provision is made for a covered area in which physical education classes are conducted. It is interesting to note that the instructor cannot stand the direct rays of the sun, so the roof was constructed over the outdoor play area primarily for her convenience.

There were 14 full-time and three part-time teachers in the West Laboratory School. They are required to hold the master's degree. Each full-time teacher receives $200 annually above the Dade County day-school salary schedule.

Each teacher has an intern assigned to her, although the provision of opportunity for student teaching experiences does not appear to be the major function of the West Laboratory School.

Keith Laboratory School
State Teachers College
Indiana, Pennsylvania

The Keith Laboratory School is so completely an integral part of State Teachers College at Indiana, Pennsylvania, it is rather difficult to define administrative responsibilities in terms of staff personnel. The office of the director of student teaching is located in the Laboratory School. The principal of the school is the assistant to the director of student teaching.

The August issue of the Teachers College Bulletin has this to say concerning the location and function of the Keith Laboratory School:

> The laboratory school located near the center of the Campus, where it is identified as a division of the College and easily accessible to students and teachers

---

[2] The Henry S. West Laboratory School (Coral Gables, Florida) p.1.

of all departments, is an integral part of the teachers college.[3]

The director of student teaching exercises close supervision over all phases of the pre-student teaching experiences of students as well as their student teaching experiences, both in the Keith School and in the off-campus student teaching program.

Individual and group observations are scheduled through the office of the director. Permits are issued to individual observers in his office, with two cards submitted to the observer, one to be submitted to the class instructor at the time of the observation and the second to be given to the college instructor at the end of the semester.

Applications for group observations are filed with the director of student teaching by the instructors. According to the Bulletin, group observations are organized as follows:

> A memo of the assignment of group observation is sent to the supervising teacher whose class will be observed and to the college instructor who will then meet with the supervising teacher to arrange a date and time according to the purposes for which the observation is to be made. Class work in the laboratory school is not interrupted for demonstration lessons, but college classes can be accommodated through careful cooperative pre-planning of the work of both groups.[4]

To facilitate the program of observation, the following additional plans are carried out:

> When arrangements are made for the observation, the date and time are reported to the office no later than four o'clock on Friday of the week preceding the observation.
>
> . . . When possible before an observation is made, the supervising teacher to be observed meets with the college class to discuss his plans for the lesson (otherwise, the plans are relayed by the college teacher).[5]

The visitation becomes much more meaningful if a follow-up session can be arranged between the classroom instructor and the visitors immediately after the class period. After student teachers have had sufficient experience, they are frequently left in charge of the class while the instructor meets with the college class, thus enabling alert student teachers to derive maximum benefit from their observation experience.

---

[3]The Keith Laboratory School, Indiana, Pennsylvania, p. 1.

[4]Ibid., pp. 3-6.

[5]Ibid., p. 8.

The number of observations increases as the students progress through their college career. In the freshman year large group observations are made, and these become smaller and more specific as the college students concentrate their interests in special areas.

This is pointed up in the Bulletin in the following explanation of observation:

> A psychology class concerned about problems of discipline observes a class in which students are analyzing their own behavior. Representatives from a class in human growth and development visit the laboratory school to secure data for sociograms. . . . Teachers of methods classes often have their students explore by observation the procedures used in teaching specific subjects.[6]

According to the Bulletin, participation becomes a major experience in the junior year:

> The nature and amount (of participation) varies with departments. For example in the art and music departments a minimum of six observations including participation is required. The experiences are planned, guided, and evaluated as a part of the methods courses which are taught by supervising teachers in the respective fields.
>
> In elementary education, where the student teaching begins in the junior and senior years, the students are required to make observations before each teaching experience; twelve observations are required in the grade in which they will be teaching prior to the first experience and six prior to the second.
>
> . . . In secondary education all college students make a minimum of twelve observations including some participation in teaching in the subject-matter areas in which they will do their student teaching. In case of a double major the student makes six observations in each area.
>
> . . . A total evaluation of observation and participation experiences is reported to the Assistant Director of Student Teaching . . . and serves as a guide in making student teaching placement assignments.[7]

The procedures followed in the student teaching program are as follows:

---

[6]Ibid., p. 10.

[7]Ibid., pp. 11-12.

> Supervising teachers in the laboratory school serve as consultants in planning professional laboratory experiences, assigning student teachers, and setting standards for improving the quality of the teaching experiences.
>
> Every student, during the quarter prior to his student teaching, is required to make application for student teaching, provide instructors' statement of recommendation, and submit a certificate of junior standing. When the application has been approved and the student has completed his observation and participation experiences satisfactorily, he is assigned for student teaching.[8]

Student teachers in the elementary area are assigned one half (nine weeks) of their student teaching experience in the junior year. In the special subject areas such as music and art, the student teacners do nine weeks of their student teaching in the laboratory school and the other nine weeks in an off-campus situation.

Student teachers in the secondary area are assigned to their major area for the entire 18 weeks. The final experience of the secondary student teachers is described as follows:

> After gradual induction into responsible teaching, student teachers eventually assume full responsibility under guidance for two classes in their major subject-matter fields; they are expected to arrange for some observation and participation experiences in their minor fields. In addition to classroom teaching, student teachers have such other responsibilities as a homeroom for a given period of time, a club or committee of their choice, library duty, intramural sports, or school publications.[9]

Constant contact is maintained between the laboratory school and the off-campus student teaching program. The cooperating teachers in the off-campus school come to the laboratory school each semester to study the program and to assist in developing techniques for improving the s tudent teaching program.

Conferences and workshops attract former student teachers for panel discussions which provide an opportunity for them to talk over the problems they experienced as beginning teachers. Leading educators in the field of student teaching often bring inspiration and information to these meetings.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 18.

[9] Ibid., p. 20.

As a final step in the completion of their experience in both the elementary and the secondary area, the student teachers are invited to submit their credentials and to request placement service. Inasmuch as the director of student teaching and his assistant also assume placement responsibilities, there is a continuous progressive relationship between the students and the laboratory school from the time they enter college as freshmen until they are ready to sign their contracts to teach after graduation.

Surely a feeling on the part of the student teacher of belonging to the laboratory school would be greater here than in situations where the pre-student teaching, student teaching, and placement are handled by different supervisory and administrative personnel.

Although the laboratory school is operated and administered by the college, it is also a part of the community of Indiana, Pennsylvania, and its environs. Through press and radio, the school seeks to keep the community informed of its program. Parents are involved in such school projects as raising funds, accompanying pupils on field trips, and endorsing away-from-school activities.

Student teachers are made aware of a community relationship through field trips into the community as well as through visits by leaders in business and industry who are brought to the school. Thus, not only is the student made aware that the schools are a part of the community, but community leaders become familiar with the school and its program.

There is another important service function of the laboratory school that involves the schools in the area that accept off-campus student teaching responsibilities. This service function to area schools is described in the Bulletin.

> Prospective teachers are entitled to guidance and educational experience that will enable them to function as effectively as possible in schools where they will be employed. . . . To help bridge the gap between pre-service and in-service education, the laboratory school staff must know the schools and the school programs in the area. Seldom does a laboratory school staff member decline an invitation to participate in a workshop or to assume responsibility for a part of the program at an education conference. It is through such contacts that staff members are informed and are able to offer more practical experiences to college students in the laboratory school. Sometimes laboratory school staff members take student teachers and participants to visit schools and classes in the area, thus making the step into their own schools and classrooms a little easier.[10]

Not only do the laboratory school teachers visit the area schools, but the teachers and administrators from the

---

[10] Ibid., p. 26.

off-campus schools also visit the laboratory school. The laboratory supervisors are challenged to evaluate their program of instruction continuously, and are motivated to be leaders in education and to demonstrate sound educational principles.

There are 14 full-time faculty members and supervisors in grades 7 through 10. Although the Handbook limits information to the secondary area, there is a classroom supervisor in each of the other grades from kindergarten through grade 6. The elementary area is organized on a self-contained classroom basis, with departmentalization starting at grade 7. Four of the secondary staff members hold the bachelor's degree, eight hold the master's degree, and two hold the doctor's degree. The teachers have the same status, rank, and salary scale as staff members in other departments of the college.

There are 350 pupils enrolled in kindergarten through grade 10. They comprise a heterogeneous group representing various social and economic groups.

Academic requirements for completion of the first 10 grades conform to those prescribed by the State of Pennsylvania. After completing grade 10, students enroll in the public high school in Indiana, Pennsylvania, to complete the requirements for high school graduation. An excellent educational program is provided as well as a comprehensive, well-organized, and well-administered program.

It is believed that one of the reasons why the student teaching program provides outstanding cooperation among the staff of the laboratory school, the college staff, and the public schools of the state is that the director of teacher training was formerly principal of the Keith Laboratory School and still works closely with the present principal in all matters pertaining to student teaching.

University School
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

The University School at Ohio State had its beginning in October, 1932. Laura Firbes and others in the Department of Education had established a kindergarten and elementary school in a private dwelling on Frambes Avenue in 1930. When the campus school was completed in October, 1933, the Frambes Avenue School was moved into the new building, and, together with the high school grades, became the University School.

As early as 1934, a bulletin of information stated two guiding principles upon which the program of the University School was based:

> The school must be the best school for its pupils that it possibly can be. No other function whether it be that of a laboratory or place of demonstration can

rank with this major purpose. The child is of primary importance.

> All school procedures, from the making of a basic philosophy to the treatment of individual differences, must be the result of a common enterprise in which interests, planning, effort, and achievement are shared.[11]

The University School at Ohio State may be better characterized by its differences than by its likenesses to the majority of campus laboratory schools. From the very beginning, the University School has prided itself on the scope and nature of demonstration of the way in which exceptionally fine teaching is done. In March, 1933, the dean of the School of Education, in a letter to the Board of Trustees, emphasized the role of the campus school as follows:

> The school was further seen . . . to be exceptional in reference to the quality of its teaching, the attention given to morals, the physical and mental health and progress of the pupils, to the manner and the order of presenting subject matter and the ways in which the different subject matter is interrelated and integrated into a progressive educational program.[12]

With these objectives in mind, the campus school was originally planned "as a demonstration and laboratory school, a place where students in the College of Education, and in the University, and school people of Ohio might observe the way in which teaching was done and in which school procedures were carried on."[13]

In these preliminary statements, no reference was made to the role which the campus school at Ohio State was destined to play, that of experimentation. In 1943, after much deliberation, a joint committee of the University School and the School of Education agreed upon four functions:

> To provide the finest possible education environment for its youth.
>
> To illustrate a way of formulating and putting into action a school philosophy.
>
> To experiment with hypotheses for improving education.

---

[11] Handbook for the University School Parents, pp. 4-5.

[12] Letter to the Board of Trustees from the Dean, College of Education.

[13] A Description of Curricular Experiences, Grades 7-12, p. 1.

To establish policies, select learning experiences, and use methods of teaching illustrating democracy at work.[14]

Although the role of demonstration, observation, and participation was referred to only by inference in these statements of functions, the school seemed to have devoted considerable time to that function. Dean Cottrell appointed an ad hoc committee on the University School May 5, 1954, with Arthur W. Foshay as chairman, to review the role of the laboratory school at Ohio State and report its findings. In the report of November 1, 1954, to the Executive Committee of the School of Education, the following statement was made concerning the purpose of the University School: "We wish to elaborate somewhat the assertion that experimentation is the fundamental purpose of the campus school."[15]

When the University School was founded, certain ideas and proposals concerning the school curriculum were undergoing wide discussion among educational leaders. It was felt to be very desirable that these ideas be put to the test of practice. Some of these ideas as they were expressed are given below:

1. The continuity, or sequence, of the school curriculum is broken by the elementary-secondary division. A 12-year school would remove this purely artificial barrier; it might allow a more coherent sequence of learning.

2. Critical thinking should be a named objective of the school's curriculum. An organization around school subjects sometimes overlooks this objective, the emphasis instead being on memory alone. A problem-centered approach to the selection of subject matter might allow greater place for the intellectual skills necessary to problem solving. These skills are referred to variously as critical thinking or the method of intelligence.

3. Differences among children are of all kinds and degrees. The usual school curriculum is pointed at a mythical "average" child; a curriculum based on problems, topics, or themes that the students help to define might be flexible enough to allow for the differences among children.

   Children differ, too, in their success in coping with their own emotions. Flexibility in the curriculum might permit modifications of planned learning so that guidance services could be fully applied to children with mild emotional disturbances.

---

[14] Ibid., p. 1.

[15] Report of the Committee on the University School, p. 2.

> The testing of these ideas and others like them has dominated the thinking of the University School staff from its beginning. Now, the thing to be noticed is this: these ideas continue to have the force today that they had 25 years ago. Despite this long trial period, there is still a great deal to be learned about the nature and limitations of the 12-year school, the development of critical thinking, and flexibility that capitalizes on (rather than penalizes) individual differences. The staff of the College of Education has a responsibility for the testing-in-action of such ideas. To do so, a laboratory school is required. Educational experimentation of this kind cannot take place in any other kind of setting.
>
> These are the reasons why the committee states with urgency that educational experimentation is the primary function of the University School.[16]

Although the Foshay Committee further emphasized experimentation as the major purpose which the University School was to serve, there is evidence in a later statement by the same committee that certain abuses had sprung up and that the experimental role had been decimated to some degree by the extent to which the University School was called upon to provide college students with observation and participation experiences.

> There may be instances in which the function we are calling experimentation and the function which we call observation demonstration are incompatible. In those instances, it is our judgment that the experiment should take precedence and that the demonstration function should be subordinated. . . . It should be observed that this committee's statement of the policy of experimentation, and the subordination of observation and demonstration, constitutes a change in the policies under which the school has operated heretofore. In earlier statements of the policy of the School, the laboratory function and demonstration function have been combined, it being clear that demonstration was the chief function. . . . This committee's proposal, that experimentation become the major purpose of the School, will result in a changing of the emphasis given in the planning of the School's program.[17]

After indicating the large numbers of observers who visited the University School during a four-quarter period (8,736 individual observations in all), the committee concluded that "most of the observations were fragmentary and inadequately interpreted."[18]

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[17] Ibid., p. 10.

[18] Ibid., p. 12.

On the basis of these facts, the committee made the following recommendations for the improvement of the role of observation and participation:

1. Observation of the University School's program and teaching shall be permitted only when assurance can be given that the observer is adequately prepared and that an adequate follow-up of his observation will be made. This will usually mean that observation will be limited to those who, through training or experience, can understand the nature of an educational experiment.

2. Participation in the teaching of the University School shall be offered to a selected number of experienced teachers, as an in-service experience.[19]

The committee makes these final recommendations concerning the policy of observation and participation:

1. The physical plant of the University School should lend itself to observation. This implies the addition to the present plant of conference rooms, one-way-vision booths, provision for the recording of classroom discussions, and a reception room for observers.

2. Moreover, the physical plant and equipment in the School should represent the best now known about school building and facilities.

3. The members of the staff of the University School whose classes are to be observed should be provided with time and facilities for participating in the preparation for, and interpretation of, observations made. This involves a very substantial change in the time allocations for teaching.

4. The number of observers present in the University School at any one time should be under the control of the staff of the University School. An "open door" policy, hospitable as it is, is not tolerable if the conditions mentioned above are to be met.[20]

Not to belabor the report of the Foshay Committee, but rather to record for future reference those parts of the report that seem most pertinent to future planning of the University School at Indiana University, the following excerpts concerning the leadership role of the staff members of the campus school are taken from the report:

---

[19] Ibid., p. 14.

[20] Ibid., p. 14-15.

> An experiment is not complete until it is reported; much of the reporting of experimentation carried on at the University School should be in the form of consultation, public appearances, and exchange of teachers, as well as formal publications. . . . In the opinion of this committee, it is high time that members of the University School staff carry their message off the campus in person.[21]

The committee further recommends that the campus school staff should assume responsibility in one or more of the following areas:

1. To design and carry out research and experimental projects; direct and write for the publication program of the school; have direct contact with the instructors and students in the teacher education program; interpret the school's program to students of education at the university and in the field; develop operational policies within the school.

2. To assume major responsibility for the instructional program of the school; participate in research and experimentation; provide for the continuity of the instructional program.

3. To be members of the school staff for not less than two but not more than three years; learn through their participation the problems, policies, procedures, practices, and methods of an experimental school; lead discussions of modern educational practices and theory, especially with visitors; carry on small individual and group research projects.[22]

Finally, the committee stressed the importance of interaction between the campus school and the rest of the campus, as well as with selected off-campus schools.

In order to facilitate this cooperation, it was recommended that, among other things, the present enrollment of 440 in the campus school should be more than doubled. The committee's recommendation was for an increased enrollment of approximately 75 pupils at each grade level, which would make a total enrollment of between 950 and 1,000 in all grades from kindergarten through grade 12. They further recommended a less selective group of students, so that the educational level of the student population would be more typical of a normally distributed population.

---

[21] Ibid., p. 15.

[22] Ibid., pp. 16-17.

Finally, the committee recommended that a new school plant be built to accommodate the increased enrollment. The building, when constructed, is to include conference rooms, office space for faculty members, observation booths, and special equipment designed to meet the needs of an experimental school.

So far as the elementary grades are concerned, the program through which the staff hopes to achieve the objectives of the school is outlined as follows:

> Pupils in grades one through six spend slightly more than half of each day working with their grade teachers. During this time, the children not only study a unit but concern themselves with many things, such as recreational reading, arithmetic skills, creative expression, and health and physical examinations. The rest of the elementary day is special-area classes; there are daily classes in physical education, art and music, and one or two periods a week in science. The classroom teacher and the area specialist often work together closely in planning experiences in these areas which will enrich a unit that is being studied. Usually, however, the special-area teacher assumes major responsibility for the instructional program during these "blocked out" periods.[23]

The total pattern of the child's development is the foundation upon which the unit plan of work is based in the elementary grades. The school is interested in what the staff refers to as "social-emotional" growth as well as in academic growth.

The program of the secondary as well as of the elementary school has been organized chiefly around problem solving. Students in grades 7 through 9 spend half of their school day working under the direction of their core teacher. Specialists in music, art, science, health, and other areas are called in to help when they are needed and available. The other half of the day is spent in 55-minute periods in mathematics, physical education, and related arts. Students in grades 10 through 12 spend approximately one third of their school day with a core teacher, have a required period in physical education, and spend the remaining four periods in elective classes.

Core, physical education, and mathematics are required of all students in grades 7 through 9; core and physical education continue as requirements until graduation. A full year of American history is required of all students during the eleventh or twelfth grade.

It is interesting to note that a very wide range of electives includes many subject-matter areas which are required in most secondary schools. Probably a combination of these

---

[23] Handbook for the University School Parents, p. 20.

makes up what is considered to be core; hence, in reality, are required courses after all.

The students participate in a wide variety of organizations such as student council, boys' and girls' clubs, and groups organized for specific purposes based upon the varied interests of pupils.

Parent-teacher conferences are less frequent in the upper secondary area than in the lower grades. The school does not use the conventional type report card, but rather a person-to-person communication is carried on in the form of a résumé of progress made by the student. With an enrollment restricted to a small pupil-teacher ratio, this method is much more feasible than in schools where each teacher has large numbers of pupils enrolled.

Certificates of recommendation for college entrance are issued to graduates in lieu of diplomas. These certificates indicate whether a graduate is (1) recommended for any college of his or her choice, (2) recommended for a particular college, or (3) not recommended for college entrance.

Information based upon personal visitation and review of the literature published by Ohio State University leads to the following conclusions:

1. The role of the campus school at Ohio State University is undergoing considerable change.

2. In the early stages, considerable difficulty was experienced in recruiting pupils in sufficient numbers to enable attainment of purposes for which the school was established.

3. Student enrollment is no longer a problem, since there are large numbers of applicants awaiting admission.

4. In the beginning, the role of experimentation was to have been the major purpose for which the school was established.

5. Demonstration, observation, and participation originally occupied so much attention that the success of experimentation was jeopardized.

In general, the Foshay Committee recommended that certain limitations be placed upon observation and participation so that more emphasis might be devoted to experimentation, furthermore, that the present enrollment of approximately 350 be more than doubled, so that those pupils enrolled would be more typical of the public school population and less skewed toward the gifted.

Finally, the recommendation was made that adequate funds be provided for experimentation.

Burris Laboratory School
Ball State Teachers College
Muncie, Indiana

The administrative staff of the Burris Laboratory School at Muncie, Indiana, follows the usual pattern of organization with the principal of the school responsible to the president of the institution in all administrative and supervisory phases of the program of the school. Other major members of the administrative staff are the assistant principal and the guidance director.

There are two Burris School districts, one an elementary school district for grades kindergarten through 6, and the other a secondary school district enrolling pupils in grades 7 through 12. These school districts are defined by written agreement between the School City of Muncie and Ball State Teachers College.

The contributions which the Burris Laboratory School has made since its beginning have been outstanding and far-reaching. The administration and faculty have recently (1957) restated their purposes as follows:

1. To create for all children and youth a living and learning environment wherein each child will develop as a unique personality to his optimum capacity; wherein each child will experience cooperative living and learning; and wherein he will obtain the knowledges and skills which will help him at each particular stage of his development to become a worthwhile member of his group.

2. To provide a laboratory in which students of education and prospective teachers in Ball State Teachers College may have first-hand experiences with children and in which they may observe methods of working with children.

3. To demonstrate through school practices a philosophy which is consistent with living in a growing democratic society.

4. To meet its responsibility for helping to improve educational practices through the development of research and experimental programs.[24]

The staff concluded their statement by emphasizing the fact that they should continue to evaluate their philosophy and practices, and, out of this evaluation, modify their policies, select learning experiences, and use methods of teaching which are consistent with a democratic philosophy.

---

[24]The Purpose of Burris Laboratory School, p. 1.

There is every indication that the staff of the Burris Laboratory School is fulfilling the role to which it has committed itself.

Whereas the role of many of the campus laboratory schools appears to have undergone rather basic and fundamental changes during the past decade, it seems that at Burris the purposes for which the school was originally established prevail at the present time. Responsibilities inherent in providing experiences for a program of student teaching have played a large part in the function of most campus laboratory schools. In many situations, student teaching serves as the focal point around which all other phases of the educational program in the campus school are organized. In some situations, demonstration, experimentation, observation, and participation are integral parts of the pre-student teaching and student teaching experiences of prospective teachers.

Since Burris Laboratory School has no responsibility in the field of student teaching, as such, the staff is free to concentrate its efforts in the area of demonstration for college students. The principal prefers to call this experience "professional laboratory experiences for college students."

Provision is also made for pre-student teaching experiences in participation and observation of the best practices in the education of elementary and secondary pupils.

In keeping with the fourth purpose stated above, the Burris Laboratory School has engaged in several experimental programs. Currently it is engaged in a mathematics experiment in cooperation with the University of Illinois. It has completed an experiment in the "Listening Processes," in which the effect of certain sounds on the learning processes of the child was studied.

The academic personnel of the Burris Laboratory School hold rank on the Ball State Teachers College faculty, are on the same salary schedule, and have the same status as other faculty members with comparable qualifications.

The 58 academic staff members, including part-time, administrative, and supervisory members, hold rank ranging from instructor to full professor, with the majority being either assistant professors or associate professors. Three persons, including the principal, hold the rank of full professor. Ten of the staff have the doctorate. Salaries of the full-time regular teaching staff range from $4,300 to $7,000 for an academic year. Staff turnover is approximately 12 per cent per year.

One of the most interesting innovations which has been made by the Burris Laboratory School is that of using the block system of scheduling in grades 7 through 12.

It is apparent that this schedule has found favor with both the teachers and the students. Other high schools in the

state have adopted the block system of scheduling and found it to be successful.

The role which the Burris Laboratory School plays in connection with student teaching has been discussed in the above paragraphs dealing with pre-student teaching experiences.

Laboratory School
Indiana State Teachers College
Terre Haute, Indiana

The administrative organization of the Laboratory School at Indiana State Teachers College at Terre Haute, Indiana, conforms to the pattern practiced in most of the other laboratory schools visited. The principal, who is in charge, has an assistant principal responsible for the day-by-day routine supervision and administration, a director of guidance, a counselor of boys, and a counselor of girls.

The staff of the Laboratory School developed a statement of philosophy in 1956. A study of this statement reveals that, unlike many laboratory schools, the enrollment consists of pupils who come from homes in the lower socioeconomic strata of society. Many of them do not finish high school, and less than half of the graduates enter college.

In view of this fact, the school attempts to "adjust the school to the needs of the student, rather than to adjust him to the needs of the school."[25] The curricular offerings must be varied and comprehensive. This fact is emphasized in the statement pertaining to courses offered in the curriculum. Their stated belief is that "required courses should be concerned primarily with common recurring problems of living and that, whenever possible, emphasis should be placed upon real life experiences while solutions are sought to these individual, social, and civic problems."[26]

The statement on educational philosophy concludes with an objective statement concerning the criteria by which the worth of their school program should be determined; namely, "A school program should be evaluated by the desirable changes in each student's behavior."[27]

The academic staff of the Laboratory School enjoy the same rank and salary as that granted to any staff member with the same qualifications on the college staff. The salary schedule provides for a beginning salary of $4,500 for those with a master's degree and no experience to a salary of $8,000 for those with the doctorate and 21 years of experience.

---

[25] Laboratory School Handbook, p. 1.

[26] Ibid., p. 1.

[27] Ibid., p. 1.

The Laboratory School has recently adopted a block system of scheduling similar to that practiced at Burris Laboratory School. Classes are 70 minutes in length as compared with the 65-minute periods at Burris. They meet four days a week with one full activity period on one day each week. A 10-minute homeroom period is provided daily, Monday through Thursday. Convocations are held on Friday.

The advantages of the 70-minute program have been summarized by the administration in a bulletin to the students as follows:

1. Instead of having one or two study halls each day you will have a part of each period for preparing your work with the assistance of your teacher of each class you are taking. There should be no necessity for more homework than you are now doing.

2. By not having "study halls," our teachers can offer six additional courses. Some of these are: Electricity, Trigonometry, more Physical Education, two classes in Speech and Dramatics, and the full Chorus and Band will meet four times each week.

3. The longer periods will be of advantage in taking field trips, setting up equipment and conducting experiments in Science, will provide more usable time in Physical Education and Shop classes, and will make it possible to better work on projects and carry out activities in all classes.

4. Since you will be able to take more classes each semester, you can select many electives of special interest to you during your four years of high school. For example, you may meet the requirements of the college preparatory course and at the same time take several courses in Commerce, in Industrial Arts, in Home Economics, in Art, etc.

5. You can feel an even greater sense of pride in your school in that it is trying out an idea that is being advocated by leading educators and is being used by some of our most outstanding schools in the United States.[28]

Six weeks after the adoption of this schedule, the teachers were asked to evaluate it. The responses indicate that the teachers consider a longer period provides more time for supervised study as well as greater opportunity for individual and group project work.

A few disadvantages were indicated by the teachers. In mathematics, the teachers felt that a lapse of time from Friday

---

[28]Laboratory School Bulletin, p. 1.

to Tuesday is too great to hold the attention of slow learners. When asked concerning adjustments made necessary by the change from the previous schedule to the block schedule, these mathematics teachers feel that very little change has been necessary in their daily work.

Many students observe and participate in the program of the Laboratory School from the nursery through the senior high school, and later do their actual student teaching there. Group observations are set up in cooperation with the college instructors in advance of visitation, while individual observations may be made without previous arrangements, provided the visitor conforms to the regularly scheduled procedures of observation.

A wide variety of extracurricular activities, including athletic contests, plays, musical productions, and social affairs, are provided for the student body. As many as possible of these are scheduled within the regular school day during one of the 70-minute periods provided for that purpose one day each week.

The number of pupils attending the Laboratory School at Indiana State Teachers College has remained somewhat constant during the past four years. In the four years since 1954-1955, the total annual enrollment has been 714, 705, 711, and 689, respectively.

The elimination of study halls and the use of the 70-minute period has given teachers more time for supervised study and has made it possible to have a more comprehensive guidance and counseling service.

The Laboratory School at Terre Haute has a particular responsibility in providing for pre-student teaching experiences as well as in providing a professional atmosphere in which student teachers gain valuable experience in preparation for entering the teaching profession. These functions are being served well.

Summary

The administrative organization of the laboratory schools visited was quite similar. The chief administrative officer held the title of either principal or director and was responsible to either the dean of the school of education or the president of the college or university in all except one of the schools, and in this one he was responsible to the director of student teaching.

In some of the schools the relationship between the laboratory school and the public school in the area in which the school was located was rather remote. In others the laboratory school shared responsibilities with the public school through an advisory committee which served as a policy-forming body in matters pertaining to the laboratory school. The

public school administration, the college or university, and the laboratory school had representation on the advisory committee.

Pupils were enrolled either on a tuition paying basis or on the basis of residence in a school district established by the city school administration.

The role of the laboratory school not only varied from school to school but, in some instances, was not the same as it was when the school was established. For example, in one midwestern school the role for which the school was originally established was experimentation; but, in a recent study made by an evaluative committee, it was reported that the role of experimentation had been largely overshadowed as a result of the demand for the school to provide pre-student teaching experiences of observation and participation for college students.

The school plant varied from the type built in the early 1930's to a very modern plant recently occupied.

Financial support for the laboratory schools was derived chiefly from two sources. Some schools required parents of pupils enrolled to pay tuition, while others had entered into a contractual agreement with the public school of the area. In the latter case, the laboratory school received funds from the city schools as per capita cost to the city school on the basis of average daily attendance.

In most schools the teachers held rank and were on the same salary schedule as faculty members of the school of education in the respective institutions. In one school the teachers were recruited from the ranks of the public schools of the city with salaries $200 above those on the city schedule.

Although some schools had no student teachers assigned to them, they were required to provide pre-student teaching opportunities for college students. In the majority of instances, the number of student teachers had been reduced through the adoption by the colleges of off-campus student teaching.

CHAPTER III

THE FINDINGS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY

Questionnaires were sent to 31 laboratory schools located on college campuses in various parts of the United States, not including those schools visited personally by the author. Four states in the Rocky Mountain area and three states along the Atlantic seaboard have no campus laboratory schools. In 10 other states, the campus laboratory schools operate either elementary or secondary schools but not both in one administrative unit. Most of these schools are affiliated with state universities and enroll pupils in kindergarten through grade 12. Since it was felt that a study of the administrative and supervisory problems in schools with organizational patterns similar to those of the University School would be most helpful, only schools of this type were sent questionnaires.

Replies were received from 94 per cent of these schools, a summary of which is given below:

The elementary division of the campus laboratory school at Ypsilanti, Michigan, was the earliest to be organized among the 29 schools reporting. Its elementary school was organized in 1880, with a secondary division being added in 1925. The number of these 29 laboratory schools established in each decade since 1880 is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. DATES OF ESTABLISHMENT OF THE 29 SCHOOLS REPLYING

Years	Number
1880-1890	3
1891-1900	4
1901-1910	6
1911-1920	6
1921-1930	5
1931-1940	2
1941-1950	1
1951-1958	1
No date given	1

Administrative personnel. The title of the administrator in charge of the campus laboratory school was either "principal" or "director" in the majority of cases, with the

title of "principal" held in 13 schools and that of "director" in 12 schools. In one school the person in charge held the title of "supervisory principal"; in another, "department head"; and in two others, "superintendent and director of student teaching."

Sixteen of the chief school administrators were directly responsible to the dean of the school of education, while nine were responsible to the president of the college or university. Two administrators whose title was that of "superintendent" were directly responsible to the Board of Education in the civil district in which their schools were located. In one instance, the director was responsible to the chancellor, while in another the principal was responsible to the director of teacher education.

Eighteen of the 29 administrators of campus laboratory schools indicated they were assigned other duties, such as teaching on the college level, while 11 replied that no other duties were assigned to them.

Each of the 29 schools listed one or more other staff members who were assigned administrative duties. The titles varied from school to school. The title "assistant principal," used in 12 schools, occurred most frequently; while that of "elementary supervisor," used in seven schools, was second in frequency.

In a few instances, the administrative assistants were called assistant to the director, while in others they were known as the dean of boys, dean of girls, supervisor in a special subject-matter area, school psychologist, or school physician.

Advisory committee. In 24 campus laboratory schools, an advisory committee served as a policy-forming body. The number comprising this committee ranged from four to 20, the median number being six.

The composition of the advisory committee varied from school to school. In addition to the directors and principals of the campus laboratory schools, such staff members as the directors of student teaching and faculty members of schools of education formed the advisory committee. In 15 schools the advisory committee members were appointed, in seven they were elected, and in seven membership was by virtue of staff position.

The role of the campus laboratory school. The questions most applicable to the current study dealt with the role of the campus laboratory school. The responses to the question concerning what they considered to be the major role of the campus laboratory school were varied, but fell into four major categories as shown in Table 2. Most of the terms used in describing the role of the campus laboratory school were terms familiar to most campus laboratory school persons. There was some overlapping in the tabulation, inasmuch as several schools listed more than one major role; for example,

demonstration and experimentation. In cases in which a school listed a dual role, it was counted in the tabulation of each characteristic.

TABLE 2. MAJOR ROLE OF CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOLS, BASED UPON RESPONSES ON 29 QUESTIONNAIRES

Major role	Number
Student teaching	24
Research and experimentation	19
Observation and participation	14
Demonstration	11

Twenty-four of the schools gave student teaching as the major role of the campus laboratory school. Research and experimentation ranked second in importance, with 19 listing that as a function, while observation and participation ranked third, with 14 schools listing these pre-student teaching experiences as of major importance. Eleven schools gave demonstration as a role to be served by the school.

Each response listed more than one role, but the combination of items appeared to have little significance. For example, those schools listing student teaching as the major role might also list demonstration as another role but make no mention of experimentation.

In response to the question as to whether the role of the campus laboratory school had changed during the past 10 years, 10 schools replied "no"; 10 indicated that there was now less emphasis on student teaching; one school indicated their student teaching responsibilities had increased; four schools stated that more emphasis was being placed upon observation, experimentation, and demonstration; one indicated that less emphasis was being given to demonstration; two schools said they were placing more emphasis on research; and one school gave education for gifted youth as the present trend in that school.

Budget. In response to the question concerning the total annual budget of the campus laboratory school, in at least seven schools the person answering the questionnaire did not know the amount budgeted for the campus laboratory school. In five other schools, the financial support of the campus laboratory school was not figured as a separate item, but formed an integral part of the total school of education or public school budget.

For the 17 campus laboratory schools that entered a specific amount as the annual budget, the range was from $40,000 to $366,252, with a median of $151,000.

Academic staff. The number of academic staff members, both part-time and full-time, in the campus laboratory schools ranged from seven to 89, with a median of 28. Seventeen of the schools had between 20 and 40 academic staff members.

The salary range of all full-time teaching staff was from $2,800 to $9,696. In some of the schools the beginning salary exceeded that of the top salary paid in other schools. For example, in one school, $5,628 was the minimum salary; whereas in nine of the schools, the top salary was less than that amount. In one situation, the highest salary paid a full-time teacher was $4,000, and in another system the beginning salary was only $2,800. It is probable that these figures are not entirely comparable, since no questions were asked concerning training, qualifications, or length of school year.

In 1957-1958 the salary range of the director or principal of the campus laboratory schools was from $5,500 to $15,000, with a median of $8,050. These figures may not be comparable, since some may have been on a 12-month basis, while others may have been on a nine-month or 10-month basis.

The minimum training qualifications for the academic staff in 25 schools was the master's degree, while in four schools it was only the bachelor's degree. Years of experience required varied from no experience in four schools to 10 years in one school. Eleven schools required three years of experience, and six schools required five years of experience as a minimum.

Staff members were appointed by the board of trustees of the college or university in 23 of the campus laboratory schools. In one instance, the board of trustees of the city school corporation in which the school was located appointed the staff members. In another situation, the staff was appointed by an advisory committee upon joint recommendation by the superintendent and the college president. In four other schools, the staff was appointed by the director.

In 25 of the campus laboratory schools, the city school superintendent did not supervise classroom teaching. In one school, the superintendent supervised to some degree, and in three schools he supervised extensively.

Non-academic staff. Non-academic staff numbered from one to 18, with a median of six. In some instances, those on the custodial staff were not under the supervision of the school administrator but belonged to a campus-wide crew.

Off-campus student teaching supervision. When asked to what extent the classroom teachers of the campus laboratory school supervised off-campus student teaching, 13 schools answered "Not at all"; 11 said "to some degree"; and four reported that the teachers supervised the off-campus student teaching program "extensively."

Summary. Information received through the questionnaires concerning various phases of the organization and work of the campus laboratory schools indicated that current practices and procedures, though varied, for the most part followed the general pattern observed in the schools that were visited.

CHAPTER IV

THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN LIGHT OF THE FINDINGS IN OTHER SCHOOLS

A careful analysis of the studies made of laboratory schools on the various college campuses reveals a doubt in the minds of some of the educators who participated in the administration of the programs of experimentation and research as to the achievement of the objectives which they had set out to accomplish. This fact led to a re-evaluation of the accomplishments of the laboratory school on some campuses. In some situations changes took place as a result of turnover in administrative leadership; in other schools, the large increase in numbers of student teachers necessitated a change of emphasis from student teaching itself to that of providing pre-student experiences for prospective teachers.

The University School
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

A written document was entered into between the Board of Trustees of Indiana University and the Trustees of the Bloomington City Schools on March 16, 1937, which established the basis of operation for the University School on the campus of Indiana University. This original contractual agreement was replaced by one signed March 1, 1941, and a supplementary agreement was added in 1948. Unlike most other laboratory schools, where enrollment began with the kindergarten, provision was made for the University School to enroll pupils in the nursery.

The laboratory school on the Indiana University campus has undergone a gradual change of function just as have the other schools studied. When it was organized in 1938, its major function was that of providing a model school in which prospective teachers had an opportunity to do student teaching.

As the number of student teachers increased, so that other facilities for experiences in student teaching had to be inaugurated, the number of student teachers practicing in the University School was reduced and an off-campus student teaching program was developed. The role of the University School gradually shifted its emphasis from student teaching to pre-student teaching experiences through observation and participation.

The scope and extent of the pre-student teaching experiences is indicated by the number of college students who for one reason or another had experiences in the classrooms during

a single semester. A careful count was made of all observers, including those students who were preparing to enter student teaching and all others who visited classes. The number of observers during the second semester of the school year, 1956-1957, was 1,179 in the elementary area (nursery through grade 6) and 1,788 in the secondary area (grades 7 through 12). During this period there were 125 School of Education students assigned as participants in all grades.

The University School still provides student teaching experiences for a small number of students who find it impossible or impracticable to do their student teaching off campus. Eight were assigned in the elementary area and 24 in the secondary area in 1956-1957.

The school operates a summer school program through the major portion of the months of June and July. A large share of the expenses of operation is borne by the State Department of Education, since the pupils in attendance in the secondary area receive credit toward graduation. The elementary school provides an enrichment program rather than a formal program in mastery of subject matter. During the summer of 1957 there were 116 observers in the elementary school and 144 in grades 7 through 12, many of whom came voluntarily to visit the classes. A majority of visitors were enrolled in education classes and were pursuing work toward graduate degrees.

It is obvious from the large numbers of students being assigned for their pre-student teaching experiences through observation and participation in the University School that an adequate job in student teaching itself would be practically impossible there.

During the school year, 1956-1957, a committee was appointed, with Dr. Shirley Engle as chairman, to make a study of the function of the University School. Among other things, the faculty of the School of Education was asked to respond to a questionnaire in which they were to indicate their opinions concerning four stated functions of the campus laboratory school.

The role of student teaching was rated lowest of the four functions; only three faculty members ranked it first in importance. Teacher preparation experiences, other than student teaching, was ranked first in importance; educational leadership through trying new ideas and providing consultant services was ranked second; and research was ranked third.

The committee made the following specific recommendations concerning the desirable function of the University School:

1. The University School should continue to serve the function of assisting in the professional preparation of teachers by providing opportunities to observe teaching, to participate in teaching, and to pursue individual investigations related to

preparation for teaching. Recognizing the desirability of using off-campus public schools for the major student teaching experience, the committee thought that the more appropriate contribution of the University School with respect to teacher preparation should be affording opportunities for carefully planned and controlled experience directly connected with course work in the theory and practice of teaching. The committee further concluded that careful consideration should be given to ways and means of extending and improving the operation of the University School with respect to this function and to the problems of better coordinating the program at University School with course work objectives in the School of Education.

2. The use of the University School as a center for research should be substantially extended. A general design for research in the University School should be formulated by the faculty of the School of Education. The nature of the staff, student population, program, and physical facilities of the University School should be modified as needed to encourage the broader use of the school for research purposes.

3. As a concomitant of increased research activity, the University School should considerably extend its effort to provide educational leadership by demonstrating advanced educational practices, by trying out new ideas, and by disseminating information about findings and advanced practices, through publication, participation of faculty members in professional meetings, sponsoring of educational conferences, promotion of inter-school staff visitation, and furnishing of consultation services.

4. While it is recognized that all of the functions enumerated above may be pursued in some measure in the University School at a given time, it is also recognized that major attention to any one of the above functions may limit in certain ways the full pursuit of others. On the other hand, it is also recognized that the exercise of one function, as for example the research function, may contribute in a very important sense to the better discharge of other functions, as for example teacher preparation and educational leadership. Although decisions will need to be made from time to time establishing priorities among functions, it is the feeling that in the long run a laboratory school which pursues vigorously all of the above enumerated functions will make the optimum contribution in each of the areas enumerated. It is thought desirable, therefore, that the University School be a multiple purpose laboratory

> school, that is, that a systematic effort be made to carry on significant and coordinated activity in each of the areas enumerated.[1]

From the review of the current literature, the Engle report, the personal visitations, and the questionnaire study, certain facts concerning the future University School seemed evident.

The role of the University School is a changing one. Major emphasis is shifting from that of student teaching to that of pre-student teaching experiences in observation and participation. This trend is characteristic of many other laboratory schools throughout the country. Some laboratory schools may be more strategically located to serve in the role of experimentation and research, while others may provide professional leadership to public schools in the area in which they are located.

Whatever the role of the campus laboratory school is to be, it would seem that a school should not attempt to discharge all the functions usually ascribed as its responsibility. Each institution should determine the role which it is best fitted to play and should plan toward the fulfillment of that role.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are a summation of the findings in this study, tailored to fit the local needs as nearly as they can be conceived in terms of planning for a new laboratory school on the Indiana University campus. Some of the recommendations are based upon preliminary planning that has already been done. All the recommendations are tentative in nature and are subject to close scrutiny and careful evaluation. It is hoped that they may stimulate further study. There is no priority as to rank in importance as they are listed here.

1. Since the campus laboratory school is no longer confined to assisting in the education of teachers, it may well expand its responsibilities to include serving as a proving ground for the improvement of all schools throughout the state of Indiana.

2. The University School is a state-supported school and is thus in a strategic position to fulfill this leadership role.

3. In assuming this leadership role, the school must accept the responsibility for conducting experimentation and

---

[1] *Report of the Committee on Function of the University School*, pp. 5-6.

research. The faculty of the School of Education plays a major role in establishing a pattern of operation for this experimentation and research.

4. The University School occupies a unique position among campus laboratory schools in its ability to attract young successful teachers to its staff. Those on the faculty of the School of Education who teach graduate courses are constantly on the alert to single out promising young teachers whom they feel should be encouraged to continue their work toward their doctorate. Some of the most successful teachers in the University School have been recruited from this source.

Teachers who are ambitious to pursue graduate work find in the University School a chance to earn six hours of graduate work while teaching full time. For many, the teaching position carries the rank of instructor and critic, a rank which extends such privileges as fee courtesy to staff members and their wives. They also enjoy all the rights and privileges of membership in all local, state, and national professional teacher organizations. Health and life insurance protection are also provided at a very minimum cost to staff members. This practice serves as an important media through which many superior graduate students are attracted to Indiana University.

5. The program of the University School should be organized and administered in such a way as to provide released time for members of the teaching staff to conduct workshops and in-service training programs throughout the state.

6. Consultant services should also be extended to all schools by the instructors and critics of the University School.

7. There should be a spirit of cooperation among the teachers of the University School and the members of the faculty of the School of Education, so that the University School staff can make the maximum contribution toward the realization of the major objectives of education.

8. Enrollment in the new school should provide for approximately 35 pupils per grade in average daily attendance in grades 1 through 6. There should be approximately 120 pupils enrolled in grades 7, 8, and 9 in order to insure an average of 100 in the graduating class in the senior high school each year.

9. The school should be so situated as to provide for not less than 30 acres of ground.

10. A planning committee should be appointed to determine the basic philosophy, aims, and objectives upon which the program of the new school should be based.

11. The planning committee should be comprised of representatives of the School of Education, the University School, the Bloomington Metropolitan Schools, and parents and pupils of the University School.

12. The final authority in all matters pertaining to the recommendation of plans and procedures should continue to be vested in the advisory committee, consisting of the superintendent of the Bloomington Metropolitan Schools, the principal of the Bloomington High School, the principal of the University School, and the dean of the School of Education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Description of Curricular Experiences, Grades 7-12, University Press, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1956, 104 pp.

Engle, Shirley H., chairman, Report of the Committee on Function of the University School, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1956-1957, 16 pp.

Foshay, Arthur W., chairman, Report of the Committee on the University School, College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1954, 25 pp.

A Handbook for University School Parents, University Press, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1954, 96 pp.

Handbook, Laboratory School, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana, 1956, 38 pp., mimeographed.

Harper, Charles A., A Century of Public Teacher Education, American Association of Teachers Colleges, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1939, p. 46.

The Henry S. West Laboratory School, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, 1957, 1 p.

Jarman, Arthur M., The Administration of Laboratory Schools, Doctor's thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1932.

The Keith Laboratory School, An Integral Part of the Teachers College, State Teachers College, Teachers College Bulletin, vol. 63, no. 3, August, 1957, Indiana, Pennsylvania, 27 pp.

Laboratory School Bulletin, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana, 1956, 6 pp., mimeographed.

Perrodin, Alex, editor, "Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education," in Thirty-fourth Yearbook of the Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1-20 pp., State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, 1955.

Pogue, E. Graham, "Professional Status of the Laboratory School Teachers," in Thirty-third Yearbook of the Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, pp. 158-170, State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, 1954.

The Purpose of Burris Laboratory School, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana, 1957, 5 pp., mimeographed.

Rugg, Harold, and Counts, George S., "A Critical Analysis of Current Methods of Curriculum Making," in Curriculum Making, p. 88, Twenty-sixth Yearbook, Part I, The National Society for the Study of Education, Chapter XXX.

Student Handbook of University High School, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi, 1957, 22 pp.

BULLETINS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, was first published in 1924 and has appeared regularly since that time. A complete list of bulletins may be obtained from the School of Education upon request. The studies included in the present and in the two volumes immediately preceding it in date are listed below. Unless otherwise indicated, these may be obtained for $1 each from the Indiana University Bookstore, Bloomington, Indiana.

Volume 33 (1957)

1. Kapos, Ervin; Mech, Edmund V.; and Fox, William H., Schoolroom Motivation: I. Two Studies of Quantity and Pattern of Verbal Reinforcement as Related to Performance on a Routine Task, 46 pp.

2. Kapos, Ervin; Mech, Edmund V.; and Fox, William H., Schoolroom Motivation: II. Two Studies of Quantity and Pattern of Verbal Reinforcement as Related to a Measure of Drive on a Routine Task, 42 pp.

3. Rufsvold, Margaret I., and Hart, Adele, Secondary School Library Personnel and Standards in Indiana, 58 pp.

4. Hoppe, Arthur, The Core in Junior High School, 44 pp.

5. Dvorak, Earl A., Review of Research in Business Education, 104 pp.

6. Indiana and Midwest School Building Planning Conference: Proceedings, 50 pp.

Volume 34 (1958)

1. Franzén, Carl G. F., Foreign Language in the Curriculum, 30 pp.

2. Mercille, Margaret G., Undergraduate Workshop in Elementary Education, 40 pp.

3. Strom, Ingrid M., The Role of Literature in the Core Curriculum, 60 pp.

4. Popham, W. James, and Standlee, Lloyd S., Out-of-School Activities and Professional Performance of Teachers, 38 pp.

5. Fay, Leo C., Improving the Teaching of Reading by Teacher Experimentation, 104 pp.

6. Standlee, Lloyd S., and Popham, W. James, Preparation and Performance of Teachers, 48 pp.

Volume 35 (1959)

1. Wright, Wendell W., and Jung, Christian W., Why Capable High School Students Do Not Continue Their Schooling, 78 pp.

2. Hughes, Otto, The Role of the Campus Laboratory School, 48 pp.